

EXHIBIT “A”

Keith Altman (*pro hac vice*)
The Law Office of Keith Altman
33228 West 12 Mile Road, Suite 375
Farmington Hills, MI 48334
(516)456-5885
kaltman@lawampmmt.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ALASKA**

DANIEL MACDONALD,
PLAINTIFF,
V.
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
SARA CHILDRESS IN HER
INDIVIDUAL AND SUPERVISORY
CAPACITY, CHASE PARKEY IN
HIS INDIVIDUAL AND
SUPERVISORY CAPACITY, SEAN
MCCARTHY, JON TILLINGHAST,
AND JOHN DOES 1-25
DEFENDANTS.

Case: 1:20-cv-00001-SLG
Hon: Sharon L. Gleason

DECLARATION OF KEITH ALTMAN IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

I, Keith Altman, declare under penalty of perjury:

1. My name is Keith Altman, and I am the principal of the Law Office of Keith Altman. I am Plaintiff's counsel in this matter and have been admitted pro hac vice.

2. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff's opposition to Defendants' motion for summary judgment.

3. As of the time of this opposition, discovery has not commenced in this matter.

4. In accordance with the parties' joint Rule 26 report, ECF # 22, discovery will not commence until 30 days after the final adjudication of the Title IX investigation.

5. To reasonably meet the merits of Defendants' pending motion for summary judgment, ECF # 32, Plaintiff needs to conduct discovery.

6. At a minimum, this discovery will include a 30(b)(6) deposition of Defendant UA as well as depositions of the individual defendants.

7. Plaintiff has not yet served document requests on Defendants.

8. Plaintiff has not yet served interrogatories on Defendants.

9. It is expected that this discovery will assist in the development of various vital questions in the pending litigation, including, but not limited to:

- a. Whether the investigation's timeline was violative of the 50-day rule and whether it was extended for good cause.
- b. Details of why Defendant Parkey was removed from the investigation.
- c. Questions concerning the training and supervision of individuals in conducting Title IX investigations.

- d. A better understanding of how Parkey's conduct influenced the investigation.
 - e. Whether there were other troubled Title IX investigations at UA
10. Without the discovery in this matter, Plaintiff cannot adequately rebut Defendants' arguments with admissible evidence and can only make arguments on legal issues.
11. Defendants have raised questions of fact in their motion which require discovery to explore fully.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 16, 2020

/s/ Keith Altman

Keith Altman